

REMARKS

1. In the Office Action dated 3/7/2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-63 under 35 USC § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Rakib et al. (U.S. Publication no. 2004/0172658). Claims 1-37 and 42-63 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the Claims is respectfully requested.

2. As discussed above, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as anticipated by Rakib. Claim 1 has been amended to include the following:

receiving, from a multimedia source, a set of selected channels, the set of selected channels including a plurality of digital channels from a single source, wherein the plurality of digital channels have a common channel format;

contemporaneously tuning each of the set of selected channels via a plurality of digital tuners to generate encoded channel data for each of the plurality of digital channels, wherein the plurality of digital tuners each operate in accordance with the common channel format;

interpreting the encoded channel data to identify a channel of interest of the set of selected channels based on a specific channel selection request, wherein each channel of the set of selected channels has a data type;

processing the encoded channel data, which includes data of the channel of interest based on the data type to produce generic data for each channel of the set of selected channels;

combining, by a channel mixer, the generic data of each channel of the set of selected channels into a stream of data;

From these elements we know that:

- a set of selected channels include a plurality of digital channels from a single source;
- the plurality of digital channels have a common channel format
- The set of selected channels from the single source are contemporaneously tuned via a plurality of digital tuners to generate encoded channel data for each of the plurality of digital channels from the single source;
- the plurality of digital tuners each operate in accordance with the common channel format

Rakib does not contemporaneously tune a plurality of digital channels from a single source that are in a common format.

In setting forth the rejection of the prior claims, the Examiner looked to a satellite VOD module 392 and satellite DirectTV module 398 as the plurality of digital tuners. In contrast to the amended claims, these two modules operate to receive channels in different digital video formats. As described in paragraph [0269] of Rakib, the VOD module 392 requires a QPSK demodulator 220, while the DirectTV module 398 requires QAM demodulator 346. The VOD content and DirectTV content are in different channel formats. In accordance with the present invention, the plurality of tuners can be interchangeable. If two client devices request two different channels from the same source and common format (e.g. channels 100 and 102 of satellite programming), these requests can be contemporaneously serviced. In Rakib's system, contemporaneous requests can only be serviced via tuners that operate in channels in different channel formats. For these reasons, claim 1 and 2-15 that depend therefrom are patentably distinct.

3. As discussed above, claims 16 and 52 were also rejected as anticipated by Rakib. Claim 52 has been amended in a similar fashion to claim 1. For similar reasons as set forth in the discussion of claim 1, claims 16 and 52 and claims 17-27 and 53-62 that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct from the prior art.

4. As discussed above, claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as anticipated by Rakib. Claim 28 has been amended to include the following:

data transcoding module operably coupled to combine, by a channel mixer, the generic data of the at least one channel into a stream of data having a specific data format and for transmission of the data stream to a plurality of client devices, wherein the at least one identified channel is accessible from the data stream by a client device of the plurality of client devices based upon the specific channel selection request, wherein the transcoding module operates to transcode the generic data in a first compressed digital video format to the specific data format in accordance with a second compressed digital video format and wherein the first

compressed digital video format differs from the second compressed digital video format.

As set forth in amended claim 28, the transcoding module operates to convert the compressed digital video format from a first compressed digital video format of the generic data to a second compressed digital video format. Rakib does not disclose such a compressed digital video format conversion. For this separate and independent reason, claim 28 and claims 29-36 that depend therefrom are patentably distinct.

5. As discussed above, claim 37 was rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as anticipated by Rakib. Claim 37 has been amended to include the following subject matter drawn from claims 38-41:

contemporaneously tuning each of the set of selected channels via a plurality of digital tuners to generate encoded channel data for each of the plurality of digital channels, wherein the encoded data includes a header portion and a payload portion, and wherein the header portion includes a channel identifier;

interpret the encoded channel data to identify a channel of interest of the set of selected channels based on a specific channel selection request by interpreting the channel identifier of the header portion of the packets to identify individual channels of the set of selected channels, wherein each channel of the set of selected channels has a data type;

In setting forth the basis of rejecting claims 38-41, the Examiner looked to portions of Rakib relating to the IP packets on the PCI bus. In contrast to the portion of claim 37 above, Rakib does not disclose including a channel identifier in the packet header. In contrast, Rakib encapsulates the channel data (e.g. VOD data) in the payload of the PCI bus packets (see, e.g. paragraph [0165]). Neither Rakib nor the Examiner provides any explanation of how a channel identifier could be included in the header of PCI bus packets. The header portions of PCI bus packets have a restricted format. For these additional reasons, claim 37 and claims 42-51 that depend therefrom are patentably distinct.

CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1-37 and 42-63 are believed to be in a condition for allowance and applicant respectfully requests that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present invention.

A request for continuing examination is concurrently filed herewith along with a credit card payment of the associated fee and a three month extension of time. No additional fees are believed to be due. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that are required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2126 (VIXS005).

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Bruce E. Stuckman reg. 36,693/
Bruce E. Stuckman
Phone: (512) 241-8444
Fax No. (512) 241-8445